UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/267,150	03/11/1999	DAVID V JAMES	SONY-50M2389	6648

7590 01/13/2005

WAGNER MURABITO & HAO
TWO NORTH MARK STREET THIRD FLOOR
SAN JOSE, CA 95113

EXAMINER	
ONUAKU, CHRISTOPHER O	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2616	

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/267,150	JAMES, DAVID V	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christopher O. Onuaku	2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 July 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-15 and 17-32* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-15&17-32* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 7/6/04

with respect to claims 1-15&17-32 have been considered but are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Yeun, alone or in combination with Brown, does not show or suggest an object identifier that is unique across the storage units. Examiner disagrees.

In col.13, lines 7-44, Yuen discloses different types of tapes, HR, PR and RI tapes, each with its own tape identification number (TID'S). When a HR tape is inserted into the VCR, for example, the VCR locates and reads the tape identification and then retrieves the corresponding directory from the RAM 33. When the PR tape is inserted into an indexing VCR, the indexing VCR 10 can quickly locate and read a copy of the directory from the VBI line. Thus, the PR tape can be read. And, in one embodiment, the TID is written on the control track of RI tapes.

Here Yuen discloses object identifier (TID) for storage units (tapes) that is unique across storage units, and that is used to uniquely and individually identify the different tapes.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. ∋ 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1,2&4-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al in view of Yuen et al (US 5,488,409).

Regarding claim 1, Brown et al disclose a system and method for generating grouped hierarchical views (with ranking) for a set of (hypermedia) objects in a query context based on one or more relationships, comprising:

a) associating an object with stored data (see col.7, lines 16-25 and col.7, lines 45-52);

b) deriving a unique object identifier for the object and assigning said unique object identifier to the object, wherein the unique object identifier is unique (see object Id and col.11, lines 33-55);

c) maintaining the object in a hierarchical organization with other objects, wherein the hierarchical organization comprises an object list, the object list containing the unique object identifier and other unique object identifiers for the other objects (see object list of Fig.7B, col.6, lines 47-67, and col.11, line 55 to col.12, line 11); and

d) accessing the object using the unique object identifier (see col.14, line 63 to col.15, line 5).

However, Brown fails to explicitly disclose wherein the unique identification number is assigned to the mass storage device and also unique to all storage devices.

Yuen et al teach apparatus and methods for facilitating and monitoring the management, storage, and retrieval of programs on a cassette tape, comprising home recorded (HR) tape, pre-recorded (PR) tape and retroactively indexed (RI) tape, wherein each one of these types of recorded tapes is assigned a unique identification number. Each time any one of these tapes (storage devices) is inserted into the VCR, the tape identification number is determined before playing the tape in order to ensure that the correct tape has been retrieved before the tape is played (see col.13, lines 7-11 and col.13, lines 20-44; and col.15, line 51 to col.16, line 6).

It would have been obvious to modify Brown by assigning unique identification number to the Brown storage devices, as taught by Yuen, in order to ensure that the correct storage device is played back, for example, during the playback process.

Brown modified with Yuen, it would have been obvious to include the identification numbers of each of the mass storage devices of Brown to the unique object id in order, for example, to facilitate the identification of each of the mass storage devices.

Regarding claim 2, Brown discloses wherein step b) comprises using an embedded system of the mass storage device to derive and assign the unique object identifier (see col.6, line 31 to col.7, line 12 and col.11, line 33 to col.12, line 11).

Regarding claim 4, Brown discloses wherein step of deriving a unique object identifier for the object and assigning the unique object identifier to the object, wherein the unique object identifier is not based on a physical location of the stored data within the mass storage unit further comprises including in the unique object identifier a unique identification number (see object Id 225 which is a unique identifier for the object that corresponds to the current entry; col.6, lines 25-30; col.11, lines 33-55).

However, Brown fails to explicitly disclose wherein the unique identification number is assigned only to the mass storage unit such that the unique object identifier is the only one of its kind.

Yuen et al teach apparatus and methods for facilitating and monitoring the management, storage, and retrieval of programs on a cassette tape, comprising home recorded (HR) tape, pre-recorded (PR) tape and retroactively indexed (RI) tape, wherein each one of these types of recorded tapes is assigned a unique identification number. Each time any one of these tapes (storage devices) is inserted into the VCR, the tape identification number is determined before playing the tape in order to ensure that the correct tape has been retrieved before the tape is played (see col.13, lines 7-11 and col.13, lines 20-44; and col.15, line 51 to col.16, line 6; and claim 1 discussions).

Regarding claim 5, Brown discloses wherein step c) further comprises creating a table of contents containing a list of objects associated with data stored on the mass storage unit (see the table of Fig.6A&6B which is a table that contains information about each of the objects in the collection; col.11, lines 33-55).

Regarding claim 6, Brown further teaches wherein step c) further comprises associating a first object to a second object using a unique object identifier for the second object (see the list in Fig.6A&7B wherein each document/object has its own object Id; col.11, line 33 to col.12, line 11).

Regarding claim 7, Brown further teaches wherein the step of accessing the object using the unique object identifier further comprises locating the first object using a unique object identifier for the first object, and locating the second object using the unique object identifier for the second object (see col.14, line 63 to col.15, line 5), here each object can be accessed by using each unique object Id.

Regarding claim 8, Brown further discloses wherein step d) further comprises locating the object using descriptive data, wherein the object contains the descriptive data for describing the stored data (see Fig.6A and a set 240 of Attributes 245; col.11, lines 33-55).

Regarding claim 9, Brown further discloses the method comprising accessing the object and executing a command using the object (see col.12, line 63 to col.13, line 23, and col.14, line 63 to col.15, line 5).

4. Claims 10-13,15,17-27&29-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al in view of Yuen and further in view of Taira (US 6,415,098).

Regarding claim 10, Brown and Yuen fail to disclose the method wherein the command specifies that the stored data associated with the object are to be recorded.

Taira teaches Taira teaches an improvement of an image recording/reproducing apparatus which records/reproduces image data with respect to a recording medium capable of recording a large amount of data comprising, including the method wherein the command specifies that the stored data associated with the object are to be recorded (see col.6, line 65 to col.7, line 3; col.11, lines 20-39). The command which specifies that the stored data are to be recorded provides the desirable advantage of allowing the user to record any desired stored data. It would have been obvious to further modify Brown by realizing Brown with the means to execute a command to record stored data, as taught by Taira, since this provides the desirable advantage of allowing a user to record any desired stored data.

Regarding claim 11, Taira teaches the method wherein the command specifies that the stored data associated with the object are be played (see col.8, lines 29-35).

Regarding claim 12, Taira teaches the method wherein the command is for writing to the stored data associated with the object (see col.8, lines 29-35).

Regarding claim 13, Taira teaches the method wherein the command is for reading from the stored data associated with the object (see col.6, line 65 to col.7, line 3; col.11, lines 20-39).

Regarding claim 15, the claimed limitations of claim 15 are accommodated in the discussions of claim 1 above, including wherein the unique object identifier is unique to the mass storage unit and across all mass storage units (see Yuen col.12, line 52 to col.13, line 44; and col.15, line 51 to col.16, line 6), except Taira further teaches a head positioned adjacent to a surface of the medium such that the data are read to and written from the surface using the head (see Taira Fig.1; optical head 11 of optical disc 10, which is a read/write head; col.4, lines 55-65, and the microcontroller for controlling movement of the head which is inherent in Taira since the optical head of Taira is movable.

Regarding claim 17, the claimed limitations of claim 17 are accommodated in the discussions of claims 4&15 above.

Regarding claim 18, the claimed limitations of claim 18 are accommodated in the discussions of claims 5&15 above.

Regarding claim 19, the claimed limitations of claim 19 are accommodated in the discussions of claims 6&15 above.

Regarding claim 20, the claimed limitations of claim 20 are accommodated in the discussions of claims 7&15 above.

Regarding claim 21, the claimed limitations of claim 21 are accommodated in the discussions of claims 8&15 above.

Regarding claim 22, the claimed limitations of claim 22 are accommodated in the discussions of claims 9&15 above.

Regarding claim 23, the claimed limitations of claim 23 are accommodated in the discussions of claims 10&15 above.

Regarding claim 24, the claimed limitations of claim 24 are accommodated in the discussions of claims 11&15 above.

Regarding claim 25, the claimed limitations of claim 25 are accommodated in the discussions of claims 12&15 above.

Regarding claim 26, the claimed limitations of claim 26 are accommodated in the discussions of claims 13&15 above.

Regarding claim 27, the claimed limitations of claim 27 are accommodated in the discussions of claim 15 above,

Regarding claim 29, the claimed limitations of claim 29 are accommodated in the discussions of claims 5&27 above.

Regarding claim 30, the claimed limitations of claim 30 are accommodated in the discussions of claims 6&27 above.

Regarding claim 31, the claimed limitations of claim 31 are accommodated in the discussions of claims 8&27 above.

Regarding claims 32, the claimed limitations of claim 32 are accommodated in the discussions of claims 9&27 above.

5. Claims 3&14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al in view of Yuen and further in view of Hoover et al (US 5,724,575).

Regarding claim 3, as discussed in claim 4 above, Yuen teaches assigning a unique identification number to each of the mass storage devices of Brown, thereby facilitating adding the mass storage identification numbers to the unique object id.

However, Brown and Yuen fail to explicitly disclose the method wherein step b) further comprises the step of including in the unique object identifier a date and time

corresponding to when the unique object identifier is derived such that the unique object identifier is unique to the mass storage unit.

Hoover et al teach an object-oriented distributed database system that transforms data stored in a plurality of remote, possibly heterogeneous user database structures into a homogeneous data model, stores location information and status information relating to the heterogeneous data via a centralized object broker for object management, thereby facilitating location and retrieval of data items from one or more of the remote, heterogeneous user databases, including object broker 20 which includes a global address space manager module 100 whose function is to allocate object identifiers or Aobject ID=s≅ from a global or galactic address space. Every instance of an object in the system is assigned a unique identifier that persists indefinitely (see Fig.6; col.22, lines 27-41). Further, the STATUS field contains information indicative of the status of information at a given remote database, and the STATUS field comprises a time stamp indicative of the date and time of last updating of information pertaining to that particular object identifier at the specified location (see col.24, line 61 to col.25, line 6). Adding date and time of last updating of information pertaining to that particular object identifier at the specified location provides the desirable advantage of providing to the user a more complete and current information on the status of a particular object identifier. Note that the examiner reads the updating of object identifier by adding the date and time of last updating of object identifier as Aincluding in said unique object identifier a date and time corresponding to when said unique object identifier is derived≅.

It would have been obvious to further modify Brown by including in said unique object identifier a date and time corresponding to when said unique object identifier is derived, as taught by Hoover, since provides the desirable advantage of providing to the user a more complete and current information on the status of a particular object identifier.

Regarding claim 14, Hoover further teaches the method wherein the mass storage device is a magnetic disk device (see Fig.2, and 6 gigabyte hard disks 20a&20b of object broker computer systems; col.12, lines 8-27). Here examiner reads a hard disk as a magnetic disk.

6. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al in view of Yuen and Taira and further in view of Hoover et al (US 5,724,575).

Regarding claim 28, the claimed limitations of claim 28 are accommodated in the discussions of claims 3&27 above.

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from this examiner should be directed to Christopher Onuaku whose telephone number is (703) 308-7555. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday to Thursday from 7:30 am to 5:00 pm. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Monday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone is unsuccessful, the examiner=s supervisor, Andrew Faile, can be reached on (703) 305-4380.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314, (for formal communications intended for entry)

and (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to Customer Service whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

COO

1/505

THAI TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER